arXiv:1405.5457v2 [math.NT] 24 Jun 2014

WEYL-TYPE HYBRID SUBCONVEXITY BOUNDS FOR TWISTED L-FUNCTIONS AND HEEGNER POINTS ON SHRINKING SETS

MATTHEW P. YOUNG

Abstract. Let q be odd and squarefree, and let χ_q be the quadratic Dirichlet character of conductor q. Let u_j be a Hecke-Maass cusp form on $\Gamma_0(q)$ with spectral parameter t_j. By an extension of work of Conrey and Iwaniec, we show $L(u_j \times \chi_q, 1/2) \ll_\varepsilon (q(1+|t_j|))^{1/3+\varepsilon}$, uniformly in both q and t_j. A similar bound holds for twists of a holomorphic Hecke cusp form of large weight k. Furthermore, we show that $|L(1/2+it, \chi_q)| \ll_\varepsilon ((1+|t|)q)^{1/6+\varepsilon}$, improving on a result of Heath-Brown.

As a consequence of these new bounds, we obtain explicit estimates for the number of Heegner points of large odd discriminant in shrinking sets.

1. Introduction

1.1. **Cubic moments.** Let χ_q be a real, primitive character of conductor q (odd, squarefree). Suppose that u_j is a Hecke-Maass cuspidal newform of level dividing q, and that $f \in B_k(q)$ where $B_k(q)$ denotes the set of weight k holomorphic Hecke newforms of level dividing q.

In a remarkable paper in the analytic theory of L-functions, Conrey and Iwaniec [CI] showed

$$\sum_{f \in B_k(q)} L(f \times \chi_q, 1/2)^3 \ll_{k,\varepsilon} q^{1+\varepsilon}, \tag{1.1}$$

for $k \geq 12$, and

$$\sum_{t_j \leq T} L(u_j \times \chi_q, 1/2)^3 \ll_{T,\varepsilon} q^{1+\varepsilon}. \tag{1.2}$$

Consequently, $L(\pi \times \chi_q, 1/2) \ll q^{1/3+\varepsilon}$ for π associated to f or u_j, by the nonnegativity of these central values [W] [KZ] [KS] [Gu]. Since the conductor of the twisted L-function is q^2, this amounts to a Weyl-type subconvexity exponent (meaning, the exponent is $1/6$ compared to the convexity bound which has exponent $1/4$) in the q-aspect. Along with the Maass forms, one naturally also includes the continuous spectrum furnished by the Eisenstein series which leads to bounds for Dirichlet L-functions, namely $L(1/2+it, \chi_q) \ll_t q^{1/6+\varepsilon}$. This subconvexity bound of Conrey and Iwaniec gave the first improvement on the Burgess bound [Bu] of $q^{3/16+\varepsilon}$, for real characters. There is also work of Heath-Brown [H-B1] that improves on the Burgess bound but for moduli that factor in a favorable way.

The bounds (1.1) and (1.2) depend polynomially on k and T, respectively, but in an unspecified way (Conrey and Iwaniec state that perhaps k^3 is acceptable). Motivated by some problems related to the equidistribution of Heegner points, it is desirable to obtain bounds as strong as possible in the T aspect; see Section 2 below for further discussion

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under agreement No. DMS-1101261. Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

of applications. Along these lines, we mention a handful of results that estimate a cubic moment in the spectral/weight aspect with fixed level (often level 1). Ivić [Iv] showed

$$\sum_{T\le t_j\le T+1} L(u_j,1/2)^3 \ll T^{1+\varepsilon}, \tag{1.3}$$

where here the Maass forms are of level 1. For reference, Weyl's law for $\Gamma_0(q)\backslash\mathbb{H}$ gives

$$\sum_{T\le t_j\le T+1} 1 \asymp qT, \tag{1.4}$$

uniformly in both $q, T \gg 1$. Ivić's approach is quite different from that of [CI], and also leads to a Weyl-type subconvexity bound for level 1 in the archimedean (spectral parameter) aspect. The weight k analog is due to Zhao Peng [Pen] who showed

$$\sum_{f\in B_k(1)} L(f,1/2)^3 \ll k^{1+\varepsilon}. \tag{1.5}$$

Again this implies a Weyl-type subconvexity bound in the weight aspect (with fixed level 1). Analogs of these cubic moments were used by Xiaoqing Li [Li] to give the first subconvexity bound for a self-dual L-function on GL_3 in the t-aspect (as well as certain $GL_3\times GL_2$ Rankin-Selberg twists). Furthermore, Blomer [Bl] obtained subconvexity for twists of a self-dual GL_3 form by a quadratic Dirichlet character in the q-aspect. Q. Lu [Lu] has modified Xiaoqing Li's [Li] method to handle variations of (1.3) with t_j in a larger window ($T \le t_j \le T+T^{3/8+\varepsilon}$), and for level q (however, no dependency on q is given).

Recently, Petrow [Pet] has shown an asymptotic formula for the cubic moment for fixed k, and q prime.

Our main result is

Theorem 1.1. *With notation as above, we have*

$$\sum_{f\in B_k(q)} L(f\times\chi_q,1/2)^3 \ll_\varepsilon (kq)^{1+\varepsilon}, \tag{1.6}$$

for $\chi_q(-1)=i^k$ (otherwise the central values all vanish), and for $T\gg 1$,

$$\sum_{T\le t_j\le T+1}^{*} L(u_j\times\chi_q,1/2)^3 \ll_\varepsilon (q(1+T))^{1+\varepsilon}, \tag{1.7}$$

where the star on the sum indicates the sum is restricted to even Maass forms (again, otherwise the central values vanish). Similarly for the Eisenstein series:

$$\int_T^{T+1} |L(1/2+it,\chi_q)|^6 dt \ll_\varepsilon (q(1+T))^{1+\varepsilon}. \tag{1.8}$$

The estimate (1.6) *holds for any even $k\ge 12$.*

The new features here compared to the previously-mentioned results is that our estimates are completely uniform in q and T (or k) together. This leads to a Weyl-type subconvexity exponent valid in a wide range in (q,T) parameter space, namely

$$L(u_j\times\chi_q,1/2) \ll (q(1+T))^{1/3+\varepsilon}, \tag{1.9}$$

and similarly for the holomorphic forms. For reference, the analytic conductor of $L(u_j\times\chi_q,1/2)$ is $q^2(1+T^2)$. The previously best-known subconvexity bound for these twisted

L-functions with uniformity in both q and T (or k) is apparently due to Blomer and Harcos [BH]. Their bound is of Burgess quality, meaning that in the q-aspect the exponent is $3/8+\varepsilon$ instead of $1/3+\varepsilon$; however, their result is more general in that it allows u_j (or f) to have arbitrary level, and the twisting character does not have to be quadratic.

One pleasant feature of our proof is that it handles the holomorphic and Maass cases simultaneously, and there is no need to use the intricate asymptotic expansions of Bessel functions uniform in both the index and the argument.

The bound (1.8) implies $|L(1/2+it,\chi_q)| \ll (q(1+|t|))^{1/6+\varepsilon}$, which improves on results of Heath-Brown [H-B1] [H-B2] and Huxley and Watt [HW], for quadratic characters.

1.2. **Arithmetical applications of the cubic moments.** We will see in Section 2 below that for applications to equidistribution of Heegner points on thin sets, the cubic moment itself is more useful than the subconvexity bound that it implies. One easy-to-state application is the following

Proposition 1.2. *Let $\frac{4}{9} < \eta \leq \frac{1}{2}$, and suppose $-D < 0$ is a sufficiently large, odd fundamental discriminant.*

(1) *There exist solutions to $b^2 \equiv -D \pmod{4a}$ for some a and b with $a \asymp D^\eta$.*
(2) *There exist solutions to $b^2 \equiv -D \pmod{4a}$ for some a and b with $b \asymp D^\eta$.*

In both cases, the number of solutions is $\gg h(-D)/D^{1/2-\eta}$, where $h(-D)$ is the class number, however the implied constant is ineffective.

These are both special cases of a more general result on the distribution of Heegner points in shrinking sets. See Theorem 2.1 below and following discussion for elaboration. In principle, a subconvexity bound of the form $L(u_j \times \chi_{-D}, 1/2) \ll D^{1/2-\delta}(1+|t_j|)^B$ (for some $\delta, B > 0$) would lead to a version of Proposition 1.2 with some $\eta < 1/2$. One purpose in this paper is to strive for a small numerical value of η.

1.3. **Acknowledgment.** I would like to thank Ian Petrow for a careful reading and extensive comments that improved the paper.

2. Applications

In this section we discuss some arithmetical applications of the new hybrid subconvexity bound. These all can be expressed as certain lattice point estimates.

The Heegner points of (fundamental) discriminant $-D < 0$ can be identified with the collection of $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$-orbits of binary quadratic forms $ax^2+bxy+cy^2$ of discriminant $b^2-4ac = -D$. To each such quadratic form, one has the Heegner point $\tau = \frac{-b+i\sqrt{D}}{2a}$ which of course can be chosen to lie inside the usual fundamental domain $\mathcal{F}$ for $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})\backslash\mathbb{H}$. Let Λ_D denote the set of $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$-classes of Heegner points of discriminant $-D$. The cardinality of Λ_D is $h(-D)$, the class number.

Duke [D] showed that Λ_D becomes equidistributed in $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})\backslash\mathbb{H}$ as $D \to \infty$, in part by extending work of Iwaniec [Iw1] bounding the Fourier coefficients of half-integral weight cusp forms. Duke used a period formula of Maass to relate the Heegner points to these Fourier coefficients.

Here we directly relate a sum over Heegner points to central L-values, which is provided by a formula of Waldspurger/Zhang [W] [Z], similarly to the style of proof of Harcos and

Michel [HM]. Suppose that u_j is a Hecke-Maass cusp form, orthonormalized with $\frac{dxdy}{y^2}$ (not probability measure), and let

$$W_{D,u_j} = \sum_{\tau \in \Lambda_D} u_j(\tau). \tag{2.1}$$

Then (e.g., see [LMY, (5.1)] for this particular formulation entirely in terms of L-functions)

$$|W_{D,u_j}|^2 = \frac{\sqrt{D} L(u_j \times \chi_{-D}, \frac{1}{2}) L(u_j, \frac{1}{2})}{2L(\mathrm{sym}^2 u_j, 1)}. \tag{2.2}$$

A similar formula holds for Eisenstein series (see [IK, (22.45)] or [LMY, (5.2)]).

Next we will set up equidistribution of Heegner points on thin sets, somewhat similarly to [Y] (which treated QUE for thin sets). In [LMY] we studied Heegner points with varying level, which is another notion of "thin": the number of Heegner points is independent of the level q (if say q is prime), yet the volume of $\Gamma_0(q)\backslash\mathbb{H}$ increases with q. The difference here is that we are fixing the level to be 1, and varying the archimedean aspect. For a given $V \geq 1$, choose a smooth and compactly-supported function $\phi : SL_2(\mathbb{Z})\backslash\mathbb{H} \to \mathbb{R}$, satisfying $|\Delta^n \phi(x+iy)| \leq C(n) V^{2n}$. We view the list of $C(n)$ as fixed, and V may vary with the discriminant $-D$.

Theorem 2.1. *Let ϕ be as above, and let $-D < 0$ be an odd fundamental discriminant. Then*

$$\sum_{\tau \in \Lambda_D} \phi(\tau) = h(-D) \int_{\mathcal{F}} \phi(z) \frac{3}{\pi} \frac{dxdy}{y^2} + O(\|\phi\|_2 D^{5/12+\varepsilon} V^{1+\varepsilon} + (DV)^{-100}). \tag{2.3}$$

The implied constant depends only on $\varepsilon > 0$ and the $C(n)$. If one assumes the Lindelöf hypothesis for $L(u_j \times \chi_{-D}, s)$ and $L(s, \chi_{-D})$, then (2.3) *holds with $D^{5/12}$ replaced by $D^{1/4}$.*

The point is that we are able to explicitly give the dependence of the error term on ϕ (previous works on equidistribution such as [D] typically treated ϕ as fixed). The implied constant is in principle effective (however quite difficult to compute); the ineffectivity in Proposition 1.2 arises from ensuring the main term is larger than the main term, which in turn relies on Siegel's lower bound on the class number.

Proof. By a spectral decomposition of ϕ, we have

$$\sum_{\tau \in \Lambda_D} \phi(\tau) = h(-D) \langle \phi, \tfrac{3}{\pi} \rangle + \sum_j \langle \phi, u_j \rangle W_{D,u_j} + (\text{Eisenstein}). \tag{2.4}$$

We bound the spectral coefficients by

$$(1/4 + t_j^2)^N \langle \phi, u_j \rangle = \langle \phi, \Delta^N u_j \rangle = \langle \Delta^N \phi, u_j \rangle \ll V^{2N} \|u_j\|_\infty. \tag{2.5}$$

Thus if $t_j \gg V(DV)^\varepsilon$, then $\langle \phi, u_j \rangle$ is very small. Therefore,

$$\Big| \sum_{\tau \in \Lambda_D} \phi(\tau) - h(-D) \langle \phi, \tfrac{3}{\pi} \rangle \Big| \leq \sum_{t_j \ll V(DV)^\varepsilon} |\langle \phi, u_j \rangle W_{D,u_j}| + (\text{Eisenstein}) + O((DV)^{-100}). \tag{2.6}$$

By Cauchy's and Bessel's inequalities, we have that (2.6) is

$$\ll \|\phi\|_2 \Big(\sum_{t_j \ll V(DV)^\varepsilon} |W_{D,u_j}|^2 \Big)^{1/2} + (\text{Eisenstein}) + (DV)^{-100}. \tag{2.7}$$

Next we use (2.2) and Hölder's inequality (with exponents $3,3,3$), giving that (2.6) is

$$\ll \|\phi\|_2 D^{\frac{1}{4}+\varepsilon} V^{\frac{1}{3}+\varepsilon} \Big(\sum_{t_j \ll V(DV)^\varepsilon} L(u_j \times \chi_{-D}, 1/2)^3 \Big)^{\frac{1}{6}} \Big(\sum_{t_j \ll V(DV)^\varepsilon} L(u_j, 1/2)^3 \Big)^{\frac{1}{6}} + \dots, \tag{2.8}$$

where the dots indicate the continuous spectrum and the error term. By Theorem 1.1, this is

$$\ll \|\phi\|_2 D^{5/12+\varepsilon} V^{1+\varepsilon} + (DV)^{-100}. \tag{2.9}$$

Note that the sums over t_j are over level 1 Maass forms, which when applying Theorem 1.1 are included into all Maass forms of level dividing D. This remark explains how the Lindelöf hypothesis replaces $D^{5/12}$ by $D^{1/4}$ in (2.3).

Although we have not explicitly written the contribution of the Eisenstein series, needless to say that the same bound holds for this part as for the Maass form contribution. □

Next we interpret this bound arithmetically. There are a variety of choices one can make. One particularly simple option is to choose ϕ to approximate the region $\frac{1}{2V} \le |x| \le \frac{1}{V}$, $1 \le y \le 2$. One can choose ϕ so that $\|\phi\|_1 \asymp V^{-1}$ and $\|\phi\|_2 \asymp V^{-1/2}$. Theorem 2.1 implies that there exists a $\tau \in \Lambda_D$ inside the support of ϕ provided that $\frac{h(-D)}{V} \gg D^{5/12+\varepsilon} V^{1/2}$, which is valid for $V \ll D^{1/18-\varepsilon}$ by Siegel's ineffective lower bound on the class number. Therefore, there exists a solution (actually, $\gg h(-D)/V$ solutions) to $b^2 \equiv -D \pmod{4a}$ with $\frac{\sqrt{D}}{a} \asymp 1$ and $|b/a| \asymp V^{-1}$. That is, $a \asymp \sqrt{D}$ and $b \asymp \sqrt{D}/V$, so setting $V = D^{1/2-\eta}$ we see that any $4/9 < \eta \le 1/2$ is allowable. This gives part (2) of Proposition 1.2.

Another option is to take ϕ approximating the characteristic function of the region $|x| \le 1/2$, $V \le y \le 2V$, giving $\|\phi\|_1 \asymp V^{-1}$, $\|\phi\|_2 \asymp V^{-1/2}$, as in the previous example. Therefore if $V \ll D^{1/18-\varepsilon}$ then the main term in Theorem 2.1 is larger than the error term. We conclude that there exists a solution to $b^2 \equiv -D \pmod{4a}$ for some $a \asymp D^{1/2}/V$ for $V \ll D^{1/18-\varepsilon}$. This gives part (1) of Proposition 1.2. These Heegner points are approaching the cusp ∞ fairly quickly.

Finally, we mention one other variation where we only ask for an upper bound on the number of Heegner points in a small box.

Corollary 2.2. *Fix $x_0 + iy_0 \in \mathcal{F}$, and let $V \gg 1$. Then the number of Heegner points $\tau \in \mathcal{F}$ of discriminant $-D$ such that $|\tau - (x_0 + iy_0)| \ll V^{-1}$ is*

$$\ll \frac{h(-D)}{V^2} + D^{5/12+\varepsilon} V^{\varepsilon}. \tag{2.10}$$

The implied constant depends on $x_0 + iy_0$ and ε.

One pleasing feature of this upper bound is that it is $o(D^{1/2})$ for a wide range of values of V. To prove Corollary 2.2, we apply Theorem 2.1 with a nonnegative function ϕ that equals 1 on $|\tau - (x_0 + iy_0)| \ll V^{-1}$, such that $\|\phi\|_1 \asymp V^{-2}$, and $\|\phi\|_2 \asymp V^{-1}$.

3. High-level sketch of the method

Here we give a brief overview of the proof focusing on the essential details. By an approximate functional equation, it suffices to show

$$\sum_{n_1,n_2,n_3 \ll (qT)^{1+\varepsilon}} \sideset{}{^*}\sum_{T \le t_j \le T+\Delta} w_j^* \frac{\chi_q(n_1 n_2 n_3) \lambda_j(n_1) \lambda_j(n_2) \lambda_j(n_3)}{\sqrt{n_1 n_2 n_3}} \ll (qT)^{1+\varepsilon}, \tag{3.1}$$

where w_j^* are weights arising in the Kuznetsov formula, so that $\sum_{T\le t_j\le T+1} w_j^* \asymp qT$ (so the weights are $\asymp 1$ on average, by Weyl's law). The Kuznetsov formula converts the sum over t_j into a sum of Kloosterman sums, transforming the left hand side of (3.1) to the form

$$q \sum_{n_1,n_2,n_3 \ll (qT)^{1+\varepsilon}} \sum_{c \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\ q)} \frac{1}{c} \frac{\chi_q(n_1n_2n_3) S(n_1n_2, n_3; c)}{\sqrt{n_1n_2n_3}} B\Big(\frac{4\pi\sqrt{n_1n_2n_3}}{c}\Big), \tag{3.2}$$

where B is given as a certain integral transform. This weight function takes the rough shape

$$B(x) \approx \frac{\Delta T}{\sqrt{x}} \cos\Big(x - 2\frac{T^2}{x} + \dots\Big) \tag{3.3}$$

and is very small for $x \ll \Delta T^{1-\varepsilon}$, meaning that we may truncate the sum over c at $\sqrt{n_1n_2n_3}/(\Delta T)$. Actually, we need to treat two different types of B because we need to restrict to a sum over the even part of the spectrum, but for Theorem 1.1 both cases are fairly similar. Suppose that each $n_i \asymp N_i$, where $N_i \ll (qT)^{1+\varepsilon}$.

Following [CI], we apply Poisson summation to each sum over n_i modulo c, transforming (3.2) into an expression of the form

$$\sum_{m_1,m_2,m_3} \sum_{c \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\ q)} \frac{q}{c} G(m_1, m_2, m_3; c) K(m_1, m_2, m_3, c), \tag{3.4}$$

where with $e_c(x) = e(x/c)$, we define

$$G(m_1, m_2, m_3; c) = c^{-3} \sum_{a_1,a_2,a_3 \,(\mathrm{mod}\ c)} \chi_q(a_1a_2a_3) S(a_1a_2, a_3; c) e_c(a_1m_1 + a_2m_2 + a_3m_3), \tag{3.5}$$

and

$$K(m_1, m_2, m_3, c) = (N_1N_2N_3)^{-1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} B\Big(\frac{4\pi\sqrt{t_1t_2t_3}}{c}\Big) e_c(-m_1t_1 - m_2t_2 - m_3t_3) dt_1dt_2dt_3. \tag{3.6}$$

Conrey and Iwaniec evaluated G, giving that if some mild coprimality restrictions are in place then with $c = qr$, we have

$$G(m_1, m_2, m_3; c) = \frac{\chi_q(-1) e_c(m_1m_2m_3)}{q^2 r} H(\overline{r} m_1m_2m_3; q), \tag{3.7}$$

where H is a certain two-variable complete character sum (see (9.3) below for its definition or (3.9) for a close variant). As for K, by an elaborate stationary phase analysis, we obtain that

$$K(m_1, m_2, m_3, c) \approx \frac{c^2 \Delta T}{(N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}} e_c(-m_1m_2m_3) e\Big(\alpha \frac{T^2 c}{m_1m_2m_3} + \dots\Big), \tag{3.8}$$

where $\alpha \neq 0$ is a fixed constant. Furthermore, K is very small unless $m_i \asymp M_i = \sqrt{N_1N_2N_3}/N_i$; this is already a square-root savings in each variable due to a reduction in length compared to N_i. Note the quite remarkable cancellation in the primary phase $e_c(m_1m_2m_3)$, as well as the common feature that G and K essentially only depend on $m_1m_2m_3/r$ and q. This feature allows for a particularly efficient separation of variables. Our work departs from [CI] in the analysis of K. When T is large, then K multiplied by $e_c(m_1m_2m_3)$ is oscillatory which makes the separation of variables nontrivial.

Next we discuss how the variables are separated, first arithmetically and then analytically. It suffices to consider a variant of H where the variables inside the summation have a coprimality condition, that is,

$$H^*(w;q) = \sum_{\substack{u,v \,(\mathrm{mod}\ q)\\ (uv-1,q)=1}} \chi_q(uv(u+1)(v+1))e_q((uv-1)w), \tag{3.9}$$

in which case from [CI, (11.9)],

$$H^*(w;q) = \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \sum_{\psi \,(\mathrm{mod}\ q)} \tau(\overline{\psi})g(\chi,\psi)\psi(w). \tag{3.10}$$

Here $g(\chi,\psi)$ is $O(q^{1+\varepsilon})$ by Deligne's bound, but otherwise we do not need any properties of g. A similar separation of variables applies to K by the Mellin transform, giving

$$K(m_1,m_2,m_3,c) \approx \frac{c^{3/2}\Delta}{(N_1N_2N_3)^{1/4}} e_c(-m_1m_2m_3)L(m_1,m_2,m_3,c), \tag{3.11}$$

where

$$L(m_1,m_2,m_3,c) = \int_{|u|\ll U} \ell(u)\Big(\frac{m_1m_2m_3}{c}\Big)^{iu}du, \qquad U = \frac{T^2c}{(N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}} \ll \frac{T}{\Delta}, \tag{3.12}$$

and $\ell(u) \ll 1$ slightly depends on the variables m_1, m_2, m_3, c, but for this sketch we pretend that it does not.

Therefore, in all, we have transformed (3.1) into an expression of the form

$$\sum_{\substack{m_1,m_2,m_3\\ m_i \asymp M_i}} \sum_r \frac{C^{3/2}\Delta}{(N_1N_2N_3)^{1/4}} \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \sum_{\psi \,(\mathrm{mod}\ q)} \frac{\tau(\overline{\psi})g(\chi,\psi)}{(qr)^2} \psi(\overline{r}m_1m_2m_3) \int_{|u|\ll U} \ell(u)\Big(\frac{m_1m_2m_3}{qr}\Big)^{iu}du, \tag{3.13}$$

where we have further restricted to $c = qr \asymp C$ (with $C \ll \sqrt{N_1N_2N_3}/(\Delta T)$). At this point the expression can be pleasantly arranged into a bilinear structure as

$$\sum_{\psi \,(\mathrm{mod}\ q)} \int_{|u|\ll U} \frac{\Delta q^{-\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}|\ell(u)g(\chi,\psi)|}{C^{\frac{1}{2}}(N_1N_2N_3)^{\frac{1}{4}}} \Big|\sum_{m_1,m_2} \psi(m_1m_2)(m_1m_2)^{iu}\Big| \cdot \Big|\sum_{m_3,r} \psi(\overline{r}m_3)\Big(\frac{m_3}{r}\Big)^{iu}\Big|du. \tag{3.14}$$

The hybrid large sieve inequality of Gallagher [Ga] bounds this by

$$\frac{\Delta q^{1/2+\varepsilon}}{C^{1/2}(N_1N_2N_3)^{1/4}} \Big(qU + M_1M_2\Big)^{1/2} \Big(qU + \frac{M_3C}{q}\Big)^{1/2} \Big(\frac{M_1M_2M_3C}{q}\Big)^{1/2}. \tag{3.15}$$

An easy calculation shows this is bounded by

$$\Delta\Big(\frac{qT}{\Delta}\Big)^{1/2}(qT)^{1/2+\varepsilon} = \Delta^{1/2}(qT)^{1+\varepsilon}, \tag{3.16}$$

consistent with our claim (3.1) (taking $\Delta = T^{\varepsilon}$).

4. Initial setup

Many of the early structural steps are similar to [CI] (and could now be considered standard), so in places we will refer to [CI] for the details.

Let $T \geq 100$ and q be an odd squarefree integer, and let $2 \leq \Delta < T/2$. Towards (1.6), we shall obtain the bound

$$\sum_{T \leq k \leq T+\Delta}^{*} \sum_{f \in B_k(q)} w_f^* L(f \times \chi_q, 1/2)^3 \ll \Delta T q (Tq)^{\varepsilon}, \tag{4.1}$$

where the star indicates that k (necessarily even) satisfies $\chi_q(-1) = i^k$, which in turn simply fixes $k \pmod 4$ (assuming q is chosen). For the Maass forms, we will show

$$\sum_{T \leq t_j \leq T+\Delta}^{*} w_j^* L(u_j \times \chi_q, 1/2)^3 \ll \Delta T q (Tq)^{\varepsilon}, \tag{4.2}$$

where w_f^* and w_j^* are certain weights arising in the Petersson/Kuznetsov formula, satisfying $w_f^* \gg (kq)^{-\varepsilon}$, $w_j^* \gg (Tq)^{-\varepsilon}$. These are the same weights used by Conrey and Iwaniec, up to a simple scaling, so we refer to [CI] for details on these weights. The sums are over newforms of level dividing q. A similar bound holds for the Eisenstein series, namely

$$\int_{T}^{T+\Delta} |L(1/2 + it, \chi_q)|^6 dt \ll \Delta T q (Tq)^{\varepsilon}. \tag{4.3}$$

All the twisted L-functions are newforms of level q^2.

In our work, we will assume $T \gg q^{\eta}$ for some fixed $\eta > 0$; in practice this will mean that expressions of the form $O(T^{-A})$ with $A > 0$ arbitrarily large, are $O((qT)^{-A'})$, with A' arbitrarily large. We are able to restrict to this case because Conrey and Iwaniec showed an upper bound of the form $T^A q^{1+\varepsilon}$ (with some fixed but unspecified $A > 0$) for the cubic moment, so if $T \ll q^{\eta}$ with η arbitrarily small, then their bound is satisfactory for Theorem 1.1. We will also suppose that $T^{\eta'} \asymp \Delta$ for some $\eta' > 0$ fixed but arbitrarily small; note that if we prove (4.1)–(4.3) for such Δ, then it extends to larger values of Δ automatically by dissecting the longer interval into these shorter pieces.

In the case of Maass forms, it is technically convenient to introduce the function

$$h(t) = \frac{1}{\cosh\left(\frac{t-T}{\Delta}\right)} + \frac{1}{\cosh\left(\frac{t+T}{\Delta}\right)}. \tag{4.4}$$

This choice of h is analytic for $|\mathrm{Im}(t)| < \frac{\pi}{2}\Delta$ (which we may assume is large), nonnegative on $\mathbb{R} \cup \{iy : -1 \leq y \leq 1\}$, and even. Furthermore, $h(t) \gg 1$ for $T \leq t \leq T + \Delta$, and $h(t)$ is very small outside of $|t \mp T| \leq \Delta$. To prove (4.2), it therefore suffices to show

$$\sum_{t_j} w_j^* h(t_j) L(u_j \times \chi_q, 1/2)^3 \ll \Delta T q (Tq)^{\varepsilon}. \tag{4.5}$$

For the holomorphic case, it is also convenient to sum over k with a smooth weight function but in this case we can take any compactly-supported function of the form $w(\frac{k-T}{\Delta})$ where $w(t) = 1$ for $1 \leq t \leq 2$, and zero for $t \leq 1/2$ and $t \geq 3$.

After some initial steps, eventually our method handles the Maass and holomorphic cases in a unified way. We shall more carefully treat the Maass case since it is a bit more complicated.

5. Approximate functional equation and separation of variables

Since all the L-functions under consideration have functional equation $+1$, we have by [IK, Theorem 5.3]

$$L(u_j \times \chi_q, 1/2) = 2\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_j(n)\chi_q(n)}{\sqrt{n}} V_{t_j}(n/q), \tag{5.1}$$

where

$$V_r(y) = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{(1)} \frac{\Gamma\Big(\frac{1/2+s+ir}{2}\Big)\Gamma\Big(\frac{1/2+s-ir}{2}\Big)}{\Gamma\Big(\frac{1/2+ir}{2}\Big)\Gamma\Big(\frac{1/2-ir}{2}\Big)} G(s)(\pi y)^{-s}\frac{ds}{s}. \tag{5.2}$$

Here $G(s)$ is an even, analytic function satisfying $G(0) = 1$. We choose $G(s) = e^{s^2}$ (this G should not be confused with (3.5)). In order to more simply sum over t_j, we wish to separate the variables r and y in $V_r(y)$. By symmetry, we may as well suppose $r > 0$.

By Stirling, if $|\mathrm{Im}(z)| \to \infty$ (with fixed real part), but $|s| \ll |z|^{1/2}$, then

$$\frac{\Gamma(z+s)}{\Gamma(z)} = z^s\Big(1 + \sum_{k=1}^{N}\frac{P_k(s)}{z^k} + O\Big(\frac{(1+|s|)^{2N+2}}{|z|^{N+1}}\Big)\Big), \tag{5.3}$$

for certain polynomials $P_k(s)$ of degree $2k$. Since $G(s)$ has exponential decay, we may truncate at $|\mathrm{Im}(s)| \ll T^{\varepsilon}$ with only a small error in $V_r(y)$. With these assumptions on s and r, we have that

$$\frac{\Gamma\Big(\frac{1/2+s+ir}{2}\Big)\Gamma\Big(\frac{1/2+s-ir}{2}\Big)}{\Gamma\Big(\frac{1/2+ir}{2}\Big)\Gamma\Big(\frac{1/2-ir}{2}\Big)} = (r/2)^s\Big(1 + \sum_{k=1}^{N}\frac{P_k(s)}{r^k} + O\Big(\frac{(1+|s|)^{2N+2}}{r^{N+1}}\Big)\Big), \tag{5.4}$$

for a different collection of polynomials $P_k(s)$. For convenience, set $P_0(s) = 1$.

Hence

$$V_r(y) = \sum_{k=0}^{N} r^{-k}\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{(1)} G(s)P_k(s)\Big(\frac{r}{2\pi y}\Big)^s\frac{ds}{s} + O\Big(r^{-N-1}\Big(1+\frac{y}{r}\Big)^{-A}\Big), \tag{5.5}$$

where the extra factor $(1+\frac{y}{r})^{-A}$ arises from moving the contour to $\mathrm{Re}(s) = A$ if $y \geq r$, and to $\mathrm{Re}(s) = -1$ if $y \leq r$. We further refine (5.5) by approximating r by T, which is a good approximation since in our application $h(r)$ is very small unless $|r-T| \ll \Delta \log T$, and Δ is a small power of T. We may assume that $|s\frac{(r-T)}{T}| \ll 1$, so that by expansion into Taylor series we have

$$r^s = T^s e^{s\log(1+\frac{r-T}{T})} = T^s\sum_{l=0}^{N} Q_l(s)\Big(\frac{r-T}{T}\Big)^l + O\Big((1+|s|)^{N+1}\Big(\frac{|r-T|}{T}\Big)^{N+1}\Big), \tag{5.6}$$

for certain polynomials $Q_l(s)$ of degree $\leq l$. We then derive for $r \asymp T$ that

$$V_r(y) = \sum_{k=0}^{N}\sum_{l=0}^{N}\frac{1}{T^k}\Big(\frac{r-T}{T}\Big)^l V_{k,l}\Big(\frac{y}{T}\Big) + O\Big(\Big(\frac{1+|r-T|}{T}\Big)^{N+1}\Big(1+\frac{y}{T}\Big)^{-A}\Big), \tag{5.7}$$

where $V_{k,l}$ is a function of the form

$$V_{k,l}(y) = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{(1)} P_{k,l}(s)(2\pi y)^{-s}G(s)\frac{ds}{s}, \tag{5.8}$$

for some polynomial $P_{k,l}$.

In light of this form of the approximate functional equation, it suffices to show

$$\sum_{t_j}^{*} h_{k,l}(t_j)w_j^* \sum_{n_1,n_2,n_3=1}^{\infty} \frac{\chi_q(n_1n_2n_3)\lambda_j(n_1)\lambda_j(n_2)\lambda_j(n_3)}{(n_1n_2n_3)^{1/2}} \prod_{i=1}^{3} V_i\Big(\frac{n_i}{Tq}\Big) + (\text{cts}) \ll \Delta(qT)^{1+\varepsilon}, \tag{5.9}$$

where (cts) represents the obvious continuous spectrum contribution (which is also nonnegative), and

$$h_{k,l}(r) = \Big((r-T)^l T^{-k-l} + (-r-T)^l T^{-k-l}\Big)h(r), \tag{5.10}$$

and V_i are functions of the form (5.8). To prepare this for the Kuznetsov formula, we use the Hecke relation $\lambda_j(n_1)\lambda_j(n_2) = \sum_{d|(n_1,n_2)} \lambda_j(\frac{n_1n_2}{d^2})$, giving that (5.9) equals

$$\sum_{(d,q)=1} d^{-1} \sum_{n_1,n_2,n_3} V_1\Big(\frac{n_1}{d^{-1}Tq}\Big)V_2\Big(\frac{n_2}{d^{-1}Tq}\Big)V_3\Big(\frac{n_3}{Tq}\Big)\frac{\chi_q(n_1n_2n_3)}{(n_1n_2n_3)^{1/2}} \sum_{j}^{*} h_{k,l}(t_j)w_j^*\lambda_j(n_1n_2)\lambda_j(n_3). \tag{5.11}$$

The Kuznetsov formula says

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j}^{*} h_{k,l}(t_j)w_j^*\lambda_j(n_1n_2)\lambda_j(n_3) + (\text{Continuous}) \\ = D\delta_{n_1n_2=n_3} + \sum_{\pm} q \sum_{c\equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\ q)} \frac{S(n_1n_2, \pm n_3; c)}{c} B^{\pm}\Big(\frac{4\pi\sqrt{n_1n_2n_3}}{c}\Big),\end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

where D is the size of the diagonal term. We have chosen our weights w_j^* so that $D \asymp \Delta Tq$, and it is easy to see that the bound arising from the diagonal terms is of the desired magnitude. Here

$$B^+(x) = \frac{i}{\pi}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Big(\frac{J_{2ir}(x) - J_{-2ir}(x)}{\cosh(\pi r)}\Big)h_{k,l}(r) r dr, \tag{5.13}$$

and

$$B^-(x) = \frac{4}{\pi^2}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} K_{2ir}(x)\sinh(\pi r)h_{k,l}(r) r dr. \tag{5.14}$$

To prove Theorem 1.1 (that is, the Maass and Eisenstein cases of the theorem), it suffices to show the following

Theorem 5.1. *Let $1 \ll N_1, N_2, N_3 \ll (qT)^{1+\varepsilon}$, and let each w_i be a smooth weight function with support on $x \asymp N_i$, and satisfying $w_i^{(k)}(x) \ll N_i^{-k}$. Suppose that B is given by* (5.13) *or* (5.14)*, with $h = h_{k,l}$ of the form* (5.10)*. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{n_1,n_2,n_3} w_1(n_1)w_2(n_2)w_3(n_3)\chi_q(n_1n_2n_3) \sum_{c\equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\ q)} \frac{S(n_1n_2, \pm n_3; c)}{c} B\Big(\frac{4\pi\sqrt{n_1n_2n_3}}{c}\Big) \\ \ll (N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}\Delta T(qT)^{\varepsilon}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

This follows by applying a smooth dyadic partition of unity to each n_i-sum.

Next we reduce the holomorphic case of Theorem 1.1 (that is, (1.6)) to a variation on Theorem 5.1. The separation of variables in the approximate functional equation is quite similar to the Maass case, so we omit the details. In this way, we quickly reduce to estimating an expression of the form (5.11) but with the sum over t_j replaced with a sum of the form

$$\sum_{k\equiv a \,(\mathrm{mod}\ 4)} h(k) \sum_{f\in B_k(q)} w_f^* \lambda_f(n_1 n_2)\lambda_f(n_3). \tag{5.16}$$

By the Petersson formula, (5.16) equals

$$D\delta_{n_1n_2=n_3} + q \sum_{c\equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\ q)} \frac{S(n_1n_2, n_3; c)}{c} B^{\mathrm{holo}}\Big(\frac{4\pi\sqrt{n_1n_2n_3}}{c}\Big), \tag{5.17}$$

where $D \asymp \Delta T q$, and

$$B^{\mathrm{holo}}(x) = \sum_{k\equiv a \,(\mathrm{mod}\ 4)} kh(k) J_{k-1}(x). \tag{5.18}$$

Here the factor k arises because we chose the weights w_f^* so that $\sum_{f\in B_k(q)} w_f^* \asymp k$. At this point we have reduced the proof of (1.6) to extending Theorem 5.1 to hold for $B = B^{\mathrm{holo}}$.

6. Exponential integrals

In Section 8 below we require extensive information on some oscillatory integrals. The stationary phase estimates we need are in principle standard, but the error terms occuring in the literature are generally not good enough for our purposes here. The issue is that Theorem 1.1 needs to hold uniformly in (q, T)-parameter space. The weight function analysis is entirely in the T-aspect, and it needs to commute with the q-aspect analysis. In practice this means that we require the error terms in the T-aspect to be very strong, as otherwise if T is only a small power of q then this error term is not much smaller than the main term, and we cannot apply savings in the q-aspect on the error term from the T-aspect. For this reason, we will quote some convenient results of [BKY] that have sufficiently strong errors.

First we begin with a useful definition.

Definition 6.1. *Suppose that $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is a smooth function on $\mathbb{R}^n$. We say that f is* inert *if*

$$x_1^{i_1} \dots x_n^{i_n} f^{(i_1,\dots,i_n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \ll 1, \tag{6.1}$$

with an implied constant depending on $i_1, \dots, i_n$ and with the superscript denoting partial differentiation.

Remark 6.2. *In practice we require that the implied list of constants is* uniform *in terms of certain parameters (e.g., q, T, Δ, N_i, C, but not necessarily ε). It is then appropriate to say that f is* uniformly *inert (in terms of those parameters).*

We remark that an inert function that is also say Schwartz class (e.g., with compact support) can have its variables separated almost for free, in the sense that

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \widehat{f}(y_1, \dots, y_n) e(x_1y_1) \dots e(x_ny_n) dy_1 \dots dy_n, \tag{6.2}$$

where $\widehat{f}(y_1, \dots, y_n) \ll (1+|y_1|)^{-A} \dots (1+|y_n|)^{-A}$. There exists a similar Mellin formula, of course. Note that the product of two inert functions is also inert (with new implied constants of course). Also if $f(t)$ is inert and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{R}$, then

$$g(x_1, \dots, x_n) = f(\prod_{i=1}^{n} (x_i/X_i)^{\alpha_i}) \tag{6.3}$$

is inert (with uniformity in the X_i but not the α_i). Virtually all our constructions of inert functions are variations of (6.3).

Next we synthesize both Lemma 8.1 and Proposition 8.2 of [BKY] along with some simplified choices of parameters, with the following

Lemma 6.3. *Suppose that w is a smooth weight function with compact support on $[X, 2X]$, satisfying $w^j(t) \ll X^{-j}$, for $X \gg 1$ (in particular, w is inert with uniformity in X). Also suppose that ϕ is smooth and satisfies $\phi^{(j)}(t) \ll \frac{Y}{X^j}$ for some $Y \gg X^{\varepsilon}$. Let*

$$I = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} w(t) e^{i\phi(t)} dt. \tag{6.4}$$

(1) *If $\phi'(t) \gg \frac{Y}{X}$ for all t in the support of w, then $I \ll_A Y^{-A}$ for A arbitrarily large.*
(2) *If $\phi''(t) \gg \frac{Y}{X^2}$ for all t in the support of w, and there exists $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\phi'(t_0) = 0$ (note t_0 is necessarily unique), then*

$$I = \frac{e^{i\phi(t_0)}}{\sqrt{\phi''(t_0)}} F(t_0) + O(Y^{-A}), \tag{6.5}$$

where F is an inert function (depending on A, but uniformly in X and Y) supported on $t_0 \asymp X$.

As a fairly direct consequence of Lemma 6.3, we shall obtain the following asymptotic formula for a certain 2-dimensional oscillatory integral. This will be used in Section 8.

Lemma 6.4. *Suppose $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, let $X \gg 1$, and suppose that $f_1(t_1)$ and $f_2(t_2)$ are (uniformly) inert functions with support on $t_1 \asymp X_1$, $t_2 \asymp X_2$ with $X_1, X_2 \gg X$. If the following inequalities are true: $\frac{\alpha}{X_1 X_2} \gg X$, $\beta X_1 \gg X$, $\gamma X_2 \gg X$, then*

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_1(t_1) f_2(t_2) e\Big(-\frac{\alpha}{t_1 t_2} - \beta t_1 - \gamma t_2\Big) dt_1 dt_2 = \Big(\frac{X_1 X_2}{\beta\gamma}\Big)^{1/2} e(-3(\alpha\beta\gamma)^{1/3}) f_3(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) + O_A((X_1+X_2)X^{-A}), \tag{6.6}$$

where f_3 is an inert function (depending on A, uniform in X_1, X_2, X), having support on

$$\frac{\alpha}{\beta} \asymp X_1^2 X_2, \qquad \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} \asymp X_1 X_2^2. \tag{6.7}$$

More generally, if we assume that

$$\frac{|\alpha|}{X_1 X_2} \gg X, \qquad |\beta| X_1 \gg X, \qquad |\gamma| X_2 \gg X, \tag{6.8}$$

then the integral in (6.6) is $O((X_1+X_2)X^{-A})$ if α, β, γ do not all have the same sign. If $\alpha, \beta, \gamma < 0$, then (6.6) remains valid, with the convention $(-1)^{1/3} = -1$. Finally, if

exactly one or exactly two of the inequalities (6.8) *are valid, then the integral in* (6.6) *is* $O((X_1+X_2)X^{-A})$.

Proof of Lemma 6.4. The basic idea is to use stationary phase analysis in each variable. Let us first examine the t_1 integral, under the assumption $\alpha,\beta,\gamma>0$. Let $Z_1=\frac{\alpha}{X_1X_2}+\beta X_1$. By repeated integration by parts (Lemma 6.3, part 1), the integral is small (namely, $O_A(Z_1^{-A})=O_A(X^{-A})$) except possibly if $\frac{\alpha}{X_1X_2}\asymp\beta X_1$. Furthermore, this argument shows the integral is very small unless α and β have the same sign (so by symmetry, α and γ have the same sign too). There exists a stationary point at $t_1^0=\sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{\beta t_2}}$. Therefore, Lemma 6.3 gives

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_1(t_1)e\Big(-\frac{\alpha}{t_1t_2}-\beta t_1\Big)dt_1=\frac{X_1^{1/2}}{\beta^{1/2}}e(-2\frac{\sqrt{\alpha\beta}}{\sqrt{t_2}}\Big)F(t_2)+O(Z_1^{-A}), \tag{6.9}$$

where $F(t_2)$ is a function that is inert in terms of α,β,t_2 (see (6.3) and surrounding discussion), and has support on an interval of the form $t_2\asymp\frac{\alpha}{\beta X_1^2}$.

Next we insert this expansion into the t_2 integral, so we need to evaluate

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e(-2\frac{\sqrt{\alpha\beta}}{\sqrt{t_2}}-\gamma t_2\Big)f_2(t_2)F(t_2)dt_2. \tag{6.10}$$

Again, (6.10) is $O(Z_2^{-A})$, where $Z_2=\frac{\alpha}{X_1X_2}+\gamma X_2$, except possibly if $X_2\asymp t_2^0:=\frac{(\alpha\beta)^{1/3}}{\gamma^{2/3}}$, in which case there is a stationary point at t_2^0. So we obtain that (6.10) equals

$$\frac{X_2^{1/2}}{\gamma^{1/2}}e(-3(\alpha\beta\gamma)^{1/3})f(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)+O(X^{-A}), \tag{6.11}$$

where f is inert (uniformly in all relevant variables), and is supported on $\frac{\alpha}{X_1X_2}\asymp\beta X_1$, and $X_2\asymp\frac{(\alpha\beta)^{1/3}}{\gamma^{2/3}}$. Note that this latter estimate can be replaced by $\frac{\alpha}{\gamma}\asymp X_1X_2^2$, which is more symmetric. Putting everything together, and simplifying, we obtain (6.6). It is easy to derive the same formula in case $\alpha,\beta,\gamma<0$ by conjugation.

The final sentence of Lemma 6.4 was proved implicitly along the way, since at least one of Z_1 and Z_2 will be large under these conditions. □

7. Analytic properties of B

Our goal in this section is to deduce some useful estimates for $B^{\pm}(x)$ and $B^{\mathrm{holo}}(x)$. Even more valuable is an integral representation for B that allows us to unify the different cases.

Lemma 7.1. *Let $B^+(x)$ be given by* (5.13). *Then for $x\ll T$, we have $B^+(x)\ll\Delta x$. Furthermore, there exists a function g depending on Δ and T satisfying $g^{(j)}(x)\ll_{j,A}(1+|x|)^{-A}$, so that*

$$B^+(x)=\Delta T\int_{|v|\le\frac{\Delta^\varepsilon}{\Delta}}\cos(x\cosh(v))e\Big(\frac{vT}{\pi}\Big)g(\Delta v)dv+O(T^{-A}). \tag{7.1}$$

Furthermore, $B^+(x)\ll T^{-A}$ unless $x\gg\Delta T^{1-\varepsilon}$. In addition, $\frac{d^k}{dx^k}B^+(x)$ is bounded by a polynomial (depending on k) of Δ,T,x, and x^{-1}.

One can find the asymptotic behavior of B^+ given by Jutila and Motohashi [JM, (3.19)], which essentially shows that it is of the shape $\frac{\Delta T}{\sqrt{x}}\cos(x+\phi(x,T,\Delta))$, where $\phi=-\frac{2T^2}{x}+\dots$, with the dots indicating lower-order terms. This comes from asymptotically evaluating the

v-integral in (7.1) by stationary phase. Our plan is to simply retain this v-integral until a later stage, and apply the stationary phase method at the very end.

The bound $B^+(x) \ll \Delta x$ for $x \ll T$ is used only for very large values of c, giving a way to initially truncate the sum over c. Note that the error term in (7.1) is problematic for very large values of c, since one needs to recover the convergence of the sum of Kloosterman sums.

Proof. Firstly, we show that for $x \ll T$, $B^+(x) \ll \Delta x$. For this, we use the integral representation

$$B^+(x) = \frac{2i}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{J_{2ir}(x)}{\cosh(\pi r)} h(r) r dr, \tag{7.2}$$

shift the contour to $\mathrm{Re}(2ir) = 1+\delta$, $0 < \delta < 1$, and apply the uniform bound (for t real and $x > 0$) $J_{1+\delta+2it}(x) \ll \cosh(\pi t)(\frac{x}{1+|t|})^{1+\delta}$, which in turn follows directly from [GR, 8.411.4]. This gives

$$B^+(x) \ll x|h(-i/2)| + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Big(\frac{x}{1+|t|}\Big)^{1+\delta} \Big|h\Big(-\frac{i}{2} - \frac{i\delta}{2} + it\Big)\Big| \cdot \Big|-\frac{i}{2} - \frac{i\delta}{2} + it\Big| dt \ll \Delta x, \tag{7.3}$$

as no other poles are crossed besides $r = -i/2$.

Now we treat the case where x is not extremely small. We have (see [GR, 8.411.11])

$$\frac{J_{2ir}(x) - J_{-2ir}(x)}{\cosh(\pi r)} = \tanh(\pi r) \frac{2}{\pi i} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \cos(x\cosh(v)) e\Big(\frac{rv}{\pi}\Big) dv, \tag{7.4}$$

so

$$B^+(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \cos(x\cosh(v)) \frac{4}{\pi^2} \int_0^{\infty} r h(r) \tanh(\pi r) e\Big(\frac{rv}{\pi}\Big) dr dv. \tag{7.5}$$

The inner integral over r is essentially the Fourier transform of a function effectively supported on $r = T + O(\Delta \log T)$ (outside of this region, h is exponentially small in terms of T), so that

$$B^+(x) = \Delta T \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \cos(x\cosh(v)) e\Big(\frac{vT}{\pi}\Big) g(\Delta v) dv + O(T^{-A}), \tag{7.6}$$

where g is a function satisfying $g^{(k)}(x) \ll_{k,A} (1+|x|)^{-A}$. By the rapid decay of g, the contribution to the integral from $|v| \gg \Delta^{-1+\varepsilon}$ is also $O(T^{-A})$, so (7.1) holds. Next we argue that $B^+(x) \ll T^{-A}$ unless $x \gg \Delta T^{1-\varepsilon}$. This follows from Lemma 6.3 (repeated integration by parts). Furthermore, a minor variation of these estimates shows $\frac{d^k}{dx^k} B^+(x) \ll_{k,A} T^{-A}$ unless $x \gg \Delta T^{1-\varepsilon}$, for $k = 1, 2, \dots$.

In order to show $\frac{d^k}{dx^k} B^+(x)$ is polynomially bounded by Δ, T, x, and x^{-1}, we take the integral representation (7.5) and treat $|v| \le 1$ and $|v| > 1$ separately. For $|v| \le 1$ we simply differentiate inside the integral sign, and use that $\cosh(v) \le \cosh(1)$ in this range; everything else is polynomially bounded in the other parameters. For $|v| \ge 1$, we cannot so simply differentiate inside the integral sign because this introduces powers of $\cosh(v)$ which causes convergence problems. To get around this, we simply first repeatedly integrate by parts to save a large enough power of $e^{\pi|v|}$ to cancel these powers of $\cosh(v)$. An alternative approach would be to use the recursion formulas for $\frac{d}{dx} J_\nu(x)$. □

Lemma 7.2. *Let $B^-(x)$ be given by (5.14). Then for $x \ll T$, we have $B^-(x) \ll_\delta \Delta T^\delta x^{1-\delta}$, for any $0 < \delta < 1$. Furthermore, there exists a function g depending on Δ and T satisfying $g^{(j)}(x) \ll_{j,A} (1+|x|)^{-A}$, so that*

$$B^-(x) = \Delta T \int_{|v| \le \frac{\Delta^\varepsilon}{\Delta}} \cos(x\sinh(v)) e\Big(\frac{vT}{\pi}\Big) g(\Delta v) dv + O(T^{-A}). \tag{7.7}$$

Furthermore, $B^-(x) \ll (x+T)^{-A}$ unless $x \asymp T$. In addition, $\frac{d^k}{dx^k} B^-(x)$ is bounded by a polyomial (depending on k) in Δ, T, x, and x^{-1}.

Proof. We quote the relation [GR, 8.486.10]

$$K_\nu(x) = \frac{x}{2\nu} K_{\nu+1}(x) - \frac{x}{2\nu} K_{\nu-1}(x), \tag{7.8}$$

which implies

$$B^-(x) = \frac{x}{i\pi^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Big(K_{1+2ir}(x) - K_{1-2ir}(x) \Big) \sinh(\pi r) h(r) dr. \tag{7.9}$$

Next by [GR, 8.432.5], we have for $\mathrm{Re}(\nu) \ge -\frac{1}{2}$,

$$K_\nu(x) = \frac{\Gamma(\nu+\frac{1}{2})(2/x)^\nu}{\Gamma(1/2)} \int_0^\infty \frac{\cos(xv)}{(v^2+1)^{\nu+\frac{1}{2}}} dv, \tag{7.10}$$

so that if $\mathrm{Re}(\nu) = \delta$ with $\delta > 0$, we have for $y \in \mathbb{R}$ by Stirling and a trivial bound

$$|K_{\delta+2iy}(x)| \ll_\delta \frac{(1+|y|)^\delta}{x^\delta \cosh(\pi y)}. \tag{7.11}$$

For the part of (7.9) with $K_{1+2ir}(x)$, we shift the contour to $\mathrm{Re}(1+2ir) = \delta > 0$, and apply (7.11). A similar procedure (shifting the other direction) works for the part with $K_{1-2ir}(x)$, so in all we obtain the bound

$$B^-(x) \ll_\delta x^{1-\delta} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (1+|y|)^\delta \exp\Big(-\Big|\frac{y-T}{2\Delta}\Big|\Big) dy \ll_\delta \Delta T^\delta x^{1-\delta}. \tag{7.12}$$

Next we derive (7.7). For this we use [GR, 8.432.4], which states

$$K_{2ir}(x)\cosh(\pi r) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \cos(x\sinh v)\cos(2rv) dv. \tag{7.13}$$

The integral does not converge absolutely, but it does converge uniformly as one can integrate by parts once to save a factor $1/\sinh(v)$. Thus we derive

$$B^-(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \cos(x\sinh(v)) \frac{1}{\pi^2} \int_0^\infty r h(r) \tanh(\pi r) e\Big(\frac{rv}{\pi}\Big) dr dv. \tag{7.14}$$

Compare this with (7.5). At this point, all the arguments from Lemma 7.1 carry over almost without change, so we omit the details. The main difference is that $\sinh(v) \sim v$ for $v = o(1)$, so by Lemma 6.3, $B^-(x)$ is small unless $x \asymp T$. □

Next we consider $B^{\mathrm{holo}}(x)$ defined originally by (5.18). By [Iw2, p.86], we have

$$B^{\mathrm{holo}}(x) = \frac{T}{4} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} W(t) c(t) dt, \tag{7.15}$$

where $W(t)$ is the Fourier transform of $w(\frac{t-T}{\Delta})$ and

$$c(t) = -2i\sin(x\sin(2\pi t)) + 2i^{1-a}\sin(x\cos(2\pi t)). \tag{7.16}$$

By direct calculation,

$$W(t) = \Delta e(-tT)\widehat{w}(-\Delta t), \tag{7.17}$$

and therefore there exists a function g such that $g^{(j)}(x) \ll (1+|x|)^{-A}$ so that

$$B^{\mathrm{holo}}(x) = \Delta T\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e\Big(\frac{vT}{\pi}\Big)g(\Delta v)(2i\sin(x\sin(v)) + 2i^{1-a}\sin(x\cos(v)))dv. \tag{7.18}$$

We can thus decompose $B^{\mathrm{holo}}(x)$ into two pieces that are precisely of the form (7.1) and (7.7) but with $\cosh(v)$ replaced by $\cos(v)$, and $\sinh(v)$ replaced by $\sin(v)$, and $\cos(x)$ replaced by $\sin(x)$. In this holomorphic case it is quite easy to show $B^{\mathrm{holo}}(x) \ll Tx$ since $\sin(x) \ll x$.

We close this section by applying these results to the cubic moment problem. Recall that we wish to show (5.15). With w_1, w_2, w_3 as in Theorem 5.1, define

$$\begin{aligned} &S_{\pm}(N_1, N_2, N_3; C; f) \\ &\quad = \sum_{\substack{c\asymp C\\ c\equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\ q)}}\sum_{n_1,n_2,n_3} \chi_q(n_1n_2n_3)S(n_1n_2, \pm n_3; c)w_1(n_1)w_2(n_2)w_3(n_3)f\Big(\frac{4\pi\sqrt{n_1n_2n_3}}{c}\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{7.19}$$

Theorem 5.1 amounts to a bound on this S with $f = B$. Using the weak bound $B(x) \ll Tx^{3/4}$, and the Weil bound for Kloosterman sums, we obtain

$$S_{\pm}(N_1, N_2, N_3; C; B) \ll T(N_1N_2N_3)^{11/8}(qT)^{\varepsilon}C^{-1/4+\varepsilon}, \tag{7.20}$$

which is satisfactory if C is a large power of qT, using $N_i \ll (qT)^{1+\varepsilon}$. Therefore, it suffices to bound S when $C \ll (qT)^A$ for some fixed but large A. For a similar reason, it suffices to bound the terms with $B(x)$ replaced by $B_0(x)$ defined by

$$B_0(x) = \Delta T\int_{|v|\le \frac{\Delta^{\varepsilon}}{\Delta}} e(x\phi(v))e\Big(\frac{vT}{\pi}\Big)g(\Delta v)dv. \tag{7.21}$$

By this discussion, we have reduced the proofs of (4.1), (4.2), and (4.3) (and hence, Theorem 1.1) to the following

Proposition 7.3. *Let B_0 be a function of the form* (7.21)*, where g is a function satisfying $g^{(j)}(x) \ll_{j,A} (1+|x|)^{-A}$, and*

$$\phi(v) \in \pm\{\cos(v), \cosh(v), \sin(v), \sinh(v)\}. \tag{7.22}$$

Then for $N_i \ll (qT)^{1+\varepsilon}$ and $C \ll (qT)^A$ with some fixed A, we have

$$S(N_1, N_2, N_3; C; B_0) \ll (N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}\Delta T(qT)^{\varepsilon}. \tag{7.23}$$

8. Analytic separation of variables

Following the method of [CI], we begin by applying Poisson summation to each of n_1, n_2, n_3 modulo c in (7.19). That is,

$$S_{\pm}(N_1, N_2, N_3; c; B_0) = \sum_{m_1,m_2,m_3\in\mathbb{Z}} G_{\pm}(m_1, m_2, m_3; c)K(m_1, m_2, m_3, c), \tag{8.1}$$

where

(8.2)
$$G_{\pm}(m_1,m_2,m_3;c)=c^{-3}\sum_{a_1,a_2,a_3 \,(\mathrm{mod}\ c)}\chi_q(a_1a_2a_3)S(a_1a_2,\pm a_3;c)e_c(a_1m_1+a_2m_2+a_3m_3),$$

and

(8.3)
$$K(m_1,m_2,m_3,c)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}w_1(t_1)w_2(t_2)w_3(t_3)B_0\Big(\frac{4\pi\sqrt{t_1t_2t_3}}{c}\Big)e_c(-m_1t_1-m_2t_2-m_3t_3)dt_1dt_2dt_3.$$

By changing variables $a_3\to -a_3$, one derives $G_-(m_1,m_2,m_3;c)=\chi_q(-1)G_+(m_1,m_2,-m_3;c)$, which will allow us to mainly focus on the + sign case. Let $G=G_+$ as shorthand.

The sum G was studied extensively by Conrey and Iwaniec [CI], so we will quote their results. Our work differs from [CI] in the nature of the weight function K. Conrey and Iwaniec showed, for T essentially bounded, that K has a phase $e_c(-m_1m_2m_3)$, and is small except for $m_i\ll (N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}/N_i$. The difficuly in extending their work is that for T larger, one needs to more carefully treat the lower order terms in the phase of K. More generally, what we show is that K still has a phase as mentioned above, but has a lower-order phase that still contains the factor $m_1m_2m_3/c$ in a block. This still allows us to use a Mellin technique to separate these four variables with a single integral. The important properties of K are summarized in the following

Lemma 8.1. *Suppose that $|m_i|\asymp M_i$ for each i, and $c\asymp C$.*

(1) *Suppose $\phi(v)$ is $\pm\cos v$ or $\pm\cosh v$. Then*

$$K(m_1,m_2,m_3,c)=\frac{C^{3/2}\Delta T(N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}e_c(-m_1m_2m_3)}{(M_1M_2M_3)^{1/2}}L(m_1,m_2,m_3,c)+O(T^{-A}\prod_{i=1}^{3}(1+|m_i|)^{-2}),\tag{8.4}$$

where L is a function that takes the form

$$L(m_1,m_2,m_3,c)=\frac{1}{V}\int_{|\mathbf{y}|\le T^{\varepsilon}}m_1^{iy_1}m_2^{iy_2}m_3^{iy_3}c^{iy_4}\int_{|u|\ll U}\ell(u,\mathbf{y})\Big(\frac{m_1m_2m_3}{c}\Big)^{iu}dud\mathbf{y},\tag{8.5}$$

where $\mathbf{y}=(y_1,y_2,y_3,y_4)$, $V=T$, and

$$U=\frac{T^2C}{(N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}}.\tag{8.6}$$

Here $\ell(u,\mathbf{y})\ll 1$ does not depend on c and the m_i. Furthermore, L vanishes unless

$$C\ll\frac{(N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}}{\Delta^{1-\varepsilon}T},\quad \text{and}\quad M_i\asymp\frac{(N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}}{N_i},i=1,2,3.\tag{8.7}$$

(2) *Suppose $\phi(v)$ is $\pm\sin v$ or $\pm\sinh v$. Then*

$$K(m_1,m_2,m_3,c)=\frac{C^{3/2}\Delta T(N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}e_c(m_1m_2m_3)}{(M_1M_2M_3)^{1/2}}L(m_1,m_2,m_3,c)+O(T^{-A}\prod_{i=1}^{3}(1+|m_i|)^{-2}),\tag{8.8}$$

with the following parameters. If $\frac{M_iN_i}{C} \gg T^\varepsilon$ *for some* i*, then* L *is defined as* (8.5) *but with* $V = T$*,* $U = X^{1/3}T^{2/3}$*, and* $X = \frac{M_1M_2M_3}{C}$*. In addition,* L *vanishes unless*

$$C \asymp \frac{(N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}}{T}, \qquad M_i \ll \frac{(N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}}{N_i\Delta^{1-\varepsilon}}, \tag{8.9}$$

and $M_1N_1 \asymp M_2N_2 \asymp M_3N_3$*. If* $\frac{M_iN_i}{C} \ll T^\varepsilon$ *for all* i *then* K *has the same form as* (8.4) *with* L *defined as* (8.5) *but with* $V = T^{-\varepsilon}X^{-1/2}$*,* $U = T^\varepsilon$*, and* $X = \frac{M_1M_2M_3}{C}$*.*

Remarks. Here the $\mathbf{y}$-integral is practically harmless, so in effect Lemma 8.1 expresses K in terms of an integral of length U, and has all variables m_1, m_2, m_3, c separated. The expressions (8.4) and (8.8) are identical except for the sign in $e_c(\mp m_1m_2m_3)$; in both cases, this phase cancels a factor coming from the calculation of $G_\pm(m_1, m_2, m_3; c)$ defined by (8.2) below. Actually, the appearance of $e_c(m_1m_2m_3)$ in (8.8) is artificial in the sense that this phase is of lower order than the phase implicit in $L(m_1, m_2, m_3, c)$ and we could have equally well showed that $e_c(m_1m_2m_3)L(m_1, m_2, m_3, c)$ has a representation in the form (8.5).

Proof. As our first step, we integrate by parts three times in each of the t_i for which $m_i \neq 0$, allowing us to obtain a crude bound of the form

$$K(m_1, m_2, m_3, c) \ll P(T, \Delta, N_1, N_2, N_3, c)\prod_{i=1}^{3}(1 + |m_i|)^{-3}, \tag{8.10}$$

where P is some fixed polyomial. This bound is sufficient for Lemma 8.1 when some m_i is $\gg T^B$ for some large B depending polynomially on A.

For the rest of the proof, suppose that $|m_i| \ll T^B$ for some B, and each i. Then in the expansion for $B(x)$ we may assume $x \gg T$, since otherwise B_0 is extremely small, and we obtain the desired bound for Lemma 8.1.

Before we jump into more intricate analysis, we can fix the sizes of C as stated in (8.7) and (8.9) using $x \asymp \frac{(N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}}{C}$, and Lemmas 7.1 and 7.2.

It is a bit awkward to directly treat K by stationary phase in each t_i, so instead we use the following workaround. By the change of variables $t_3 = u/(t_1t_2)$, we obtain

$$K(m_1, m_2, m_3, c) = \int_0^\infty B_0\Big(\frac{4\pi\sqrt{u}}{c}\Big)I(u)du + O(T^{-A}), \tag{8.11}$$

where

$$I(u) = \int_0^\infty\int_0^\infty w_3\Big(\frac{u}{t_1t_2}\Big)w_1(t_1)w_2(t_2)e_c(-\frac{m_3u}{t_1t_2} - m_1t_1 - m_2t_2)\frac{dt_1dt_2}{t_1t_2}. \tag{8.12}$$

The asymptotic expansion of $I(u)$ will be derived from Lemma 6.4. This saves the more difficult case of stationary phase with B_0 for last when the integral is one-dimensional. This feature pleasantly allows us to unify cases for as long as possible since we do not use any properties of B_0 until the later stages.

Suppose that

$$\frac{M_iN_i}{C} \gg T^\varepsilon, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \tag{8.13}$$

so that the integrand defining $I(u)$ is oscillatory. The opposite case is somewhat easier and we will return to it later. Lemma 6.4 then shows that

$$I(u) = \frac{c}{(m_1m_2N_1N_2)^{1/2}} e\Big(-\frac{3(m_1m_2m_3u)^{1/3}}{c}\Big) w_4(u) + O(T^{-A}), \tag{8.14}$$

where w_4 is a smooth function supported on $u \asymp N_1N_2N_3$, depending on m_1, m_2, m_3, c, etc., but that is inert in all variables. Furthermore, we derive from (6.7) that w_4 vanishes unless

$$m_1N_1 \asymp m_2N_2 \asymp m_3N_3. \tag{8.15}$$

Hence we derive

$$K = \Big(\frac{c\Delta T}{(m_1m_2N_1N_2)^{1/2}} \int_{|v|\le \frac{\Delta^\varepsilon}{\Delta}} e\Big(\frac{vT}{\pi}\Big) g(\Delta v) \int_0^\infty e\Big(\frac{2\sqrt{u}}{c}\phi(v) - \frac{3(m_1m_2m_3u)^{1/3}}{c}\Big) w_4(u)dudv\Big) + O(T^{-A}). \tag{8.16}$$

The u-integral can also by analyzed by stationary phase, as (8.13) and Part 1 of Lemma 6.3 shows that it is small unless a stationary point exists, which implies

$$|\phi(v)| \asymp |m_1m_2m_3|^{1/3}(N_1N_2N_3)^{-1/6}, \tag{8.17}$$

(additionally, $\phi(v)$ must have the same sign as $m_1m_2m_3$). Note that if $\phi(v) = \pm\cos v$ or $\pm\cosh v$ then $|\phi(v)| \asymp 1$ so this implies $|m_1m_2m_3| \asymp (N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}$, which by (8.15) leads to the assumption $M_i \asymp (N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}/N_i$ in Part 1 of Lemma 8.1.

However, if $\phi(v) = \pm\sin v$ or $\pm\sinh v$, then we obtain $|v| \asymp |m_1m_2m_3|^{1/3}(N_1N_2N_3)^{-1/6}$, and since $|v| \le \Delta^{-1+\varepsilon}$, we conclude that $|m_1m_2m_3| \ll (N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}\Delta^{-3+\varepsilon}$. Again using (8.15) leads to the upper bound on M_i in (8.9).

Assuming (8.17), the stationary point at $u_0 = (m_1m_2m_3)^2/\phi(v)^6$ potentially lies inside the support of w_4, so

$$\int_0^\infty e\Big(\frac{2\sqrt{u}}{c}\phi(v) - \frac{3(m_1m_2m_3u)^{1/3}}{c}\Big) w_4(u)du = \frac{c^{1/2}(N_1N_2N_3)^{5/6}}{|m_1m_2m_3|^{1/6}} e\Big(-\frac{m_1m_2m_3}{c\phi(v)^2}\Big) w_5(v) + O(T^{-A}), \tag{8.18}$$

where w_5 is inert in terms of v as well as the m_i and c, and w_5 has support on (8.17). The fact that w_5 is inert in terms of v perhaps requires some discussion. We naturally obtain an inert function in terms of $\phi(v)$, but since $\phi(v)$ has bounded derivatives for $|v| \le 1$, we do in fact obtain an inert function of v.

By inserting (8.18) into (8.16), and using (8.15) to obtain a more symmetric expression, we derive

$$K(m_1, m_2, m_3, c) = \frac{c^{3/2}\Delta T(N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}}{|m_1m_2m_3|^{1/2}} e\Big(\mp\frac{m_1m_2m_3}{c}\Big)\Phi\Big(\frac{m_1m_2m_3}{c}\Big) + O(T^{-A}), \tag{8.19}$$

where

$$\Phi(x) = \int_{|v|\le\frac{\Delta^\varepsilon}{\Delta}} e\Big(\frac{vT}{\pi}\Big) g(\Delta v) e\Big(x(\pm 1 - \phi(v)^{-2})\Big) w_6(v)dv, \tag{8.20}$$

and w_6 is another inert function having the same properties as w_5. Here the $\mp$ sign in (8.19) is $-$ for the $\cos v$ or $\cosh v$ cases, and $+$ for the $\sin v$ or $\sinh v$ cases, and the sign in (8.20) respects these.

Finally we shall use the Mellin technique to analyze $\Phi(x)$.

Lemma 8.2. *Suppose that g is a function satisfying $g^{(j)}(x) \ll_{j,A} (1+|x|)^{-A}$, $\phi(v)$ is given via (7.22), and Φ is defined by (8.20) for some inert function w_6. Then for $x \asymp X \gg 1$, we have*

$$\Phi(x) = \frac{1}{T}\int_{|t|\ll U} \lambda_{X,T}(t) x^{it} dt + O(T^{-A}), \tag{8.21}$$

where $\lambda_{X,T}$ and U depend on X, T, and the choice of $\phi(v)$, and satisfy $\lambda_{X,T}(t) \ll 1$ and

$$\begin{cases} U = T^2/X & \phi(v) = \pm\cosh(v) \text{ or } \pm\cos(v) \\ U = X^{1/3}T^{2/3} & \phi(v) = \pm\sinh(v) \text{ or } \pm\sin(v). \end{cases} \tag{8.22}$$

Proof of Lemma 8.2. Suppose that $1 \le Y < y < 2Y$, and let $w(y)$ be a smooth function such that $w(y) = 1$ on this interval, and $w(y) = 0$ for $y < Y/2$ and $y > 3Y$. By the Mellin inversion formula, for $Y < y < 2Y$, we have

$$e(y) = w(y)e(y) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t) y^{it} dt, \qquad f(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^\infty w(y)e(y) y^{-it}\frac{dy}{y}. \tag{8.23}$$

Integration by parts shows $f(t) \ll (|t|+Y)^{-A}$ unless $t \asymp Y$, in which case $f(t) \ll Y^{-1/2}$, by stationary phase. We sometimes write $f = f_Y$ to help us remember the parameter associated to f.

We will use this in $\Phi(x)$, however we need to treat the two types of ϕ a bit differently. If $\phi(v) = \pm\sin v$ or $\pm\sinh v$, we have $|\phi(v)| \asymp |v| = o(1)$, so $x|1+\phi(v)^{-2}| \asymp X/|v|^2$, and thus letting $|v_0| = |m_1m_2m_3|^{1/3}(N_1N_2N_3)^{-1/6}$ (recall v is supported for $|v| \asymp |v_0|$), we have

$$\Phi(x) = \int_{|t|\asymp X/|v_0|^2} f_{X/v_0^2}(t) x^{it}\Big(\int_{|v|\le \frac{\Delta^\varepsilon}{\Delta}} e\Big(\frac{vT}{\pi}\Big) g(\Delta v)(\phi(v)^{-2}+1)^{it} w_6(v) dv\Big) dt + O(T^{-A}). \tag{8.24}$$

We need to bound the inner integral over v. By a Taylor expansion, we have

$$(\phi(v)^{-2}+1)^{it} = e^{-2it\log v + it(d_2v^2 + d_4v^4 + \dots)}, \tag{8.25}$$

for certain constants d_i (depending only on the choice of $\sin v$ or $\sinh v$) so the v-integral is small except near the stationary point $|v| \asymp (t/T)$. Note that we have $|v_0| \asymp \frac{|t|}{T} \asymp \frac{X}{v_0^2 T}$, so that $|v_0| \asymp (x/T)^{1/3}$. As a pleasant consistency check, note that $x \asymp \frac{M_1M_2M_3}{C}$, and so $(x/T)^{1/3} \asymp (M_1M_2M_3)^{1/3}(N_1N_2N_3)^{-1/6}$, using (8.9). The length of the t-integral is therefore seen to be $X/|v_0|^2 \asymp X^{1/3}T^{2/3}$, consistent with the claimed size of U in the second line of (8.22). In the inner v-integral, the second derivative of the phase is of size t/v_0^2, so we have

$$\int_{|v|\le \frac{\Delta^\varepsilon}{\Delta}} e\Big(\frac{vT}{\pi}\Big) g(\Delta v)(1+\phi(v)^{-2})^{it} w_6(v) dv \ll \frac{|v_0|}{\sqrt{|t|}}, \tag{8.26}$$

and therefore $f_{X/v_0^2}(t)\frac{|v_0|}{\sqrt{|t|}} \ll \frac{|v_0|^2}{\sqrt{X}\sqrt{|t|}} \asymp \frac{|v_0|^3}{X} \asymp T^{-1}$, leading to the bound on $\lambda_{X,T}(t)$ in the second line of (8.22).

Next we treat $\phi(v) = \pm\cos v$ or $\pm\cosh v$. Here we have, for certain constants d_i',

$$1 - \phi(v)^{-2} = \frac{1}{2}v^2 + d_4'v^4 + d_6'v^6 + \dots, \tag{8.27}$$

so in this case we may initially restrict the v-integral so that $v \asymp T/x$ (prior to aplying the t-integral formula for $e(y)$), using Lemma 6.3 again. In this range, we have $x(1-\phi(v)^{-2}) \asymp T^2/X$, so that

$$\Phi(x) = \int_{|t|\asymp T^2/X} f_{T^2/X}(t)x^{it}\Big(\int_{|v|\asymp \frac{T}{X}} e\Big(\frac{vT}{\pi}\Big)g(\Delta v)(1-\phi(v)^{-2})^{it}w_6(v)dv\Big)dt + O(T^{-A}). \tag{8.28}$$

Now we have

$$(1-\phi(v)^{-2})^{it} = e^{2it\log v + it\log(1+c_4v^2+c_6v^4+\dots)}. \tag{8.29}$$

The second derivative of the phase is of size $t/v^2 \asymp X$. Hence

$$\int_{|v|\le \frac{\Delta^\varepsilon}{\Delta}} e\Big(\frac{vT}{\pi}\Big)g(\Delta v)(1-\phi(v)^{-2})^{it}w_6(v)dv \ll X^{-1/2}, \tag{8.30}$$

and $f_{T^2/X}(t)X^{-1/2} \ll T^{-1}$. □

Now we apply Lemma 8.2 to (8.19), where recall that we restrict to $c \asymp C$, and $|m_i| \asymp M_i$. Then we have $X = C^{-1}M_1M_2M_3$, and so in the $\pm\cos v$ or $\pm\cosh v$ cases, we have $U = \frac{T^2}{X} = \frac{T^2C}{M_1M_2M_3} \asymp \frac{T^2C}{(N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}}$, so we have shown (8.4). The $\pm\sin v$ or $\pm\sinh v$ cases are similar.

Finally, we consider the case where

$$\frac{M_iN_i}{C} \ll T^\varepsilon. \tag{8.31}$$

In the $\pm\cos v$ or $\pm\cosh v$ cases, we claim that K is very small. To see this, we go back to the original definition (8.3), combined with (7.21). We also recall that $B(x)$ is small unless $x \gg \Delta T^{1-\varepsilon}$, which means that each t_i-integral is oscillatory. Therefore, Lemma 6.3 shows that K is small unless $M_i \asymp (N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}/N_i$; in other words, the inequalities in (8.7) remain valid. But then,

$$\frac{M_iN_i}{C} \asymp \frac{(N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}}{C} \gg \Delta T^{1-\varepsilon}, \tag{8.32}$$

which is not consistent with (8.31) (meaning, K is small).

Next we study the $\pm\sin v$ or $\pm\sinh v$ cases. Again we use (8.3) and (7.21), and change variables $t_i \to N_it_i$, to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} K = \Delta T(N_1N_2N_3)\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\Big(\prod_{i=1}^3 w_i(N_it_i)e_c(-m_iN_it_i)\Big) \\ \int_{|v|\le\frac{\Delta^\varepsilon}{\Delta}} e\Big(\frac{2\sqrt{N_1N_2N_3}}{c}\sqrt{t_1t_2t_3}\phi(v)\Big)e\Big(\frac{vT}{\pi}\Big)g(\Delta v)dvdt_1dt_2dt_3 + O(T^{-A}). \end{aligned} \tag{8.33}$$

The v-integral is small unless $\frac{\sqrt{N_1N_2N_3}}{C} \asymp T$. The phase of each t_i integral is then of size $T|v| + O(T^\varepsilon)$, using (8.31). Thus if $|v| \gg T^{-1+\varepsilon}$, then repeated integration by parts shows K is small, so in (8.33) we may shorten the v-integral by assuming $|v| \ll T^{-1+\varepsilon}$, without creating a new error term. Next we artificially multiply K by $e_c(-m_1m_2m_3)e_c(m_1m_2m_3)$, and use a Mellin transform to separate the variables in $e_c(-m_1m_2m_3)$ (we keep the plus sign

part as it is, since it is visible in (8.8)). The cost in doing this is an integral of length $O(T^{\varepsilon})$, by (8.31). Thus in all we obtain an expression of the form

$$K = \Delta(N_1N_2N_3)e_c(m_1m_2m_3)L(m_1, m_2, m_3, c) + O(T^{-A}), \tag{8.34}$$

where L is of the form (8.5), with $V = T^{-\varepsilon}$, and $U = T^{\varepsilon}$. To put this into the form of (8.4), we use

$$\Delta N_1N_2N_3 \asymp \Delta T(N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}C = \frac{C^{3/2}\Delta T(N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}}{(M_1M_2M_3)^{1/2}}\Big(\frac{M_1M_2M_3}{C}\Big)^{1/2}, \tag{8.35}$$

which is now of the desired form by absorbing $X^{-1/2}$ into the V appearing in (8.5). □

9. Arithmetic separation of variables and the large sieve

The material in this section is logically independent of Section 8.

According to Lemma 10.2 of [CI], we have an evaluation of G as follows. Let $c = qr$ with q squarefree, and suppose

$$(m_3, r) = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad (m_1m_2, q, r) = 1. \tag{9.1}$$

Then

$$G(m_1, m_2, m_3; c) = e_c(m_1m_2m_3)\frac{h\chi_{kl}(-1)}{rq^2\phi(k)}R_k(m_1)R_k(m_2)R_k(m_3)H(\overline{rhk}m_1m_2m_3; l), \tag{9.2}$$

where $h = (r, q)$, $k = (m_1m_2m_3, q)$, $l = q/(hk)$, and $R_k(m) = S(0, m; k)$ is the Ramanujan sum. If the coprimality conditions (9.1) are not satisfied then G vanishes. Here

$$H(w; q) = \sum_{u,v \,(\mathrm{mod}\ q)} \chi_q(uv(u+1)(v+1))e_q((uv-1)w). \tag{9.3}$$

Also see [CI, (11.7)], giving

$$H(w; q) = \sum_{q_1q_2=q} \mu(q_1)\chi_{q_1}(-1)H^*(\overline{q_1}w; q_2), \tag{9.4}$$

where

$$H^*(w; q) = \sum_{\substack{u,v \,(\mathrm{mod}\ q)\\ (uv-1,q)=1}} \chi_q(uv(u+1)(v+1))e_q((uv-1)w), \tag{9.5}$$

and from [CI, (11.9)],

$$H^*(w; q) = \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \sum_{\psi \,(\mathrm{mod}\ q)} \tau(\overline{\psi})g(\chi, \psi)\psi(w). \tag{9.6}$$

Lemma 9.1 (Hybrid large sieve)**.** *Suppose $U \geq 1$, and let a_n be a sequence of complex numbers. Then*

$$\int_{-U}^{U} \sum_{\psi \,(\mathrm{mod}\ q)} \Big|\sum_{n\leq N} a_n\psi(n)n^{iu}\Big|^2 du \ll (qU + N)\sum_{n\leq N}|a_n|^2. \tag{9.7}$$

This is Theorem 2 of [Ga].

Lemma 9.2. *Suppose that q is odd and squarefree, and let $\alpha_{m_1}, \beta_{m_2}, \gamma_{m_3}, \delta_r$ be any sequence of complex numbers. Suppose $(b_1 b_2, q) = 1$, a is a nonzero real number, and $U \geq 1$. Then we have*

$$\int_{|u|\leq U} \Big| \sum_{\substack{m_1,m_2,m_3 \\ m_i \asymp M_i}} \sum_{r \ll R} \alpha_{m_1}\beta_{m_2}\gamma_{m_3}\delta_r H^*(\overline{b_1 r} b_2 m_1 m_2 m_3; q) \Big(\frac{m_1 m_2 m_3}{ar}\Big)^{iu} \Big| du \tag{9.8}$$
$$\ll q^{1/2+\varepsilon}(qU + M_1M_2)^{1/2}(qU + M_3R)^{1/2} \Big(\sum_{m_1,m_2,m_3,r} |\alpha_{m_1}\beta_{m_2}\gamma_{m_3}\delta_r|^2 \Big)^{1/2}.$$

The implied constant depends only on ε. Furthermore, (9.8) *holds with H^* replaced by H. In addition, if we restrict the sums over m_3 and r so that $(m_3, r) = 1$, then the left hand side of* (9.8) *(with either H^* or H) is*

$$\ll q^{1/2+\varepsilon}(qU + M_1M_2)^{1/2}(qU + M_3R)^{1/2} \Big(\sum_{d,m_1,m_2,m_3,r} d^{1+\varepsilon} |\alpha_{m_1}\beta_{m_2}\gamma_{dm_3}\delta_{dr}|^2 \Big)^{1/2} \tag{9.9}$$

This is a variation on Lemma 11.1 of [CI] where the main difference is that here we have an integral which detects orthogonality in the archimedean aspect.

Proof. By (9.6), the left hand side of (9.8) equals

$$\int_{|u|\leq U} \Big| \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \sum_{\psi \,(\mathrm{mod}\, q)} \sum_{\substack{m_1,m_2,m_3 \\ m_i \asymp M_i}} \sum_{r \ll R} \alpha_{m_1}\beta_{m_2}\gamma_{m_3}\delta_r \tau(\overline{\psi}) g(\chi,\psi)\psi(\overline{b_1 r} b_2 m_1 m_2 m_3) \Big(\frac{m_1 m_2 m_3}{ar}\Big)^{iu} \Big| du, \tag{9.10}$$

which we arrange into a bilinear form by grouping together m_1 and m_2 as well as m_3 and r, giving that (9.10) is bounded by

$$\int_{|u|\leq U} \sum_{\psi \,(\mathrm{mod}\, q)} \frac{|g(\chi,\psi)\tau(\overline{\psi})|}{\phi(q)} \Big| \sum_{m_1,m_2} \alpha_{m_1}\beta_{m_2}\psi(m_1 m_2)(m_1 m_2)^{iu} \Big| \cdot \Big| \sum_{m_3,r} \gamma_{m_3}\delta_r \psi(\overline{r} m_3) \Big(\frac{m_3}{r}\Big)^{iu} \Big| du. \tag{9.11}$$

Conrey and Iwaniec showed $|g(\chi,\psi)| \ll q^{1+\varepsilon}$, and of course $|\tau(\overline{\psi})| \leq q^{1/2}$ (e.g., see Lemma 3.1 of [IK]). By Cauchy's inequality, and some rearrangements, we obtain that this is

$$\ll q^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon} \Big(\int_{|u|\leq U} \sum_{\psi \,(\mathrm{mod}\, q)} \Big| \sum_{n \ll M_1M_2} a_n \psi(n) n^{iu} \Big|^2 du \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Big(\int_{|u|\leq U} \sum_{\psi \,(\mathrm{mod}\, q)} \Big| \sum_{n \ll M_3R} b_n \psi(n) n^{iu} \Big|^2 du \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{9.12}$$

where (a_n) is the Dirichlet convolution of (α_{m_1}) and (β_{m_2}), and likewise for (b_n). By Lemma 9.1, we obtain the bound (9.8), as desired.

The case with $(m_3, r) = 1$ follows similar lines. In (9.11) we use Möbius inversion, writing $\sum_{d|(m_3,r)} \mu(d)$ to detect this condition. Then we move the sum over d to the outside, and apply Cauchy's inequality, in the form $|\sum_d a_d|^2 \leq \zeta(1+\varepsilon)\sum_d d^{1+\varepsilon}|a_d|^2$. The remaining steps are identical to the previous case.

To replace H^* by H, we use (9.4) and apply (9.8) or (9.9), whichever is appropriate. □

Lemma 9.3. *Let conditions be as in Lemma 9.2. Then*

$$\int_{|u|\leq U}\Big|\sum_{\substack{m_1,m_2,m_3\\ m_i\asymp M_i}}\sum_{r\asymp R}\alpha_{m_1}\beta_{m_2}\gamma_{m_3}\delta_r G(m_1,m_2,m_3,qr)e_{-qr}(m_1m_2m_3)\Big(\frac{m_1m_2m_3}{qr}\Big)^{iu}\Big|du \tag{9.13}$$
$$\ll \frac{q^{1/2+\varepsilon}}{Rq^2}(qU+M_1M_2)^{1/2}(qU+M_3R)^{1/2}\Big(\sum_{d,m_1,m_2,m_3,r}d^{1+\varepsilon}|\alpha_{m_1}\beta_{m_2}\gamma_{dm_3}\delta_{dr}|^2\Big)^{1/2}.$$

Remark: If $\gamma_{m_3}\ll 1$ and $\delta_r\ll 1$, which is all that we require in our use of Lemma 9.3, then the extra sum over d does not change the bound arising from $d=1$.

Proof. By (9.2), we obtain that the left hand side of (9.13) is of the form

$$\int_{|u|\leq U}\Big|\sideset{}{^*}\sum_{\substack{m_1,m_2,m_3\\ m_i\asymp M_i}}\sum_{r\asymp R}\alpha_{m_1}\beta_{m_2}\gamma_{m_3}\delta_r\frac{h\chi_{kl}(-1)}{rq^2\phi(k)} \tag{9.14}$$
$$R_k(m_1)R_k(m_2)R_k(m_3)H(\overline{rhk}m_1m_2m_3;l)\Big(\frac{m_1m_2m_3}{qr}\Big)^{iu}\Big|du,$$

where h,k,l are functions of the other variables, and the star on the sum indicates that (9.1) holds. Lemma 9.2 immediately shows that the most important terms $h=k=1$, $l=q$ give the stated bound, but of course we need to treat all cases. We may assume that the coefficients are zero unless $m_i\asymp M_i$, and $r\asymp R$. Next we write $r=hr'$ where $h|q$ and $(r',q/h)=1$. Note that (9.1) means $(m_1,h)=(m_2,h)=(m_3,h)=1$, and $(m_3,r')=1$. We also move the sum over k to the outside, giving that the left hand side of (9.13) is

$$\ll\sum_{hk|q}\frac{h}{Rq^2\phi(k)}\int_{|u|\leq U}\Big|\sideset{}{^*}\sum_{\substack{m_1,m_2,m_3\\ (m_1m_2m_3,q)=k}}\sideset{}{^*}\sum_{(r',m_3)=1}\alpha_{m_1}\beta_{m_2}\gamma_{m_3}\delta_{hr'} \tag{9.15}$$
$$R_k(m_1)R_k(m_2)R_k(dm_3)H(\overline{r'h^2k}m_1m_2m_3;l)\Big(\frac{m_1m_2m_3}{r'}\Big)^{iu}\Big|du,$$

where the stars on the sums indicate the already-listed coprimality conditions. The key point is that these conditions are only of the form $(m_i',s)=1$ where s is an integer independent of the other m_i', and r' (and similarly for the condition on r'). In this way, we can absorb these conditions into the definition of the coefficients without altering the upper bound on their magnitude.

The next problem is that the condition $(m_1m_2m_3,q)=k$ is in terms of the *product* of the m_i and so these variables are not separated. However, this is easily solved as follows. For fixed $k|q$, the condition $(m_1m_2m_3,q)=k$ means $(m_1m_2m_3,k)=k$ and $(m_1,q/k)=(m_2,q/k)=(m_3,q/k)=1$. We can parameterize the solutions to $(m_1m_2m_3,k)=k$ as follows. Suppose $(m_1,k)=k_1$, and write $m_1=k_1m_1'$, $k=k_1k'$, so $(m_1,k')=1$. Now $(m_2m_3,k')=k'$, so we can repeat this argument giving say $(m_2,k')=k_2$, $m_2=k_2m_2'$, $k'=k_2k_3$, and so therefore $(m_3,k_3)=k_3$, so we may write $m_3=k_3m_3'$. In this way we separate the m_i'.

Therefore (9.15) is

$$\ll \sum_{\substack{hk|q\\ k=k_1k_2k_3}} \frac{h}{Rq^2\phi(k)} \int_{|u|\le U} \Big| \sum_{m_1',m_2',m_3'}^{*} \sum_{\substack{r'\asymp R/h\\ (r',m_3')=1}}^{*} \alpha_{k_1m_1'}\beta_{k_2m_2'}\gamma_{k_3m_3'}\delta_{hr'} R_k(m_1'k_1)R_k(m_2'k_2)R_k(m_3'k_3)H(\overline{r'h^2}m_1'm_2'm_3';l)\Big(\frac{m_1m_2m_3}{r'}\Big)^{iu}du\Big|. \tag{9.16}$$

Using $|R_k(m)| \le (m,k)$, we easily see that

$$\sum_{m_1'\ll M_1/k_1}^{*} |\alpha_{k_1m_1'}|^2 |R_{k_1k_2k_3}(k_1m_1')|^2 \le k_1^2 \sum_{m_1\ll M_1} |\alpha_{m_1}|^2, \tag{9.17}$$

and similarly for m_2' and m_3'. Therefore, Lemma 9.2 shows that the left hand side of (9.13) is

$$\ll \sum_{h|q} \sum_{k_1k_2k_3=k|q} \frac{h}{Rq^2\phi(k)} \Big(\frac{q}{hk}\Big)^{\frac12+\varepsilon} \Big(\frac{qU}{hk}+\frac{M_1M_2}{k_1k_2}\Big)^{\frac12} \Big(\frac{qU}{hk}+\frac{M_3R}{k_3h}\Big)^{\frac12} \Big(k^2 \sum_{d,m_1,m_2,m_3,r} d^{1+\varepsilon}|\alpha_{m_1}\beta_{m_2}\gamma_{dm_3}\delta_{dr}|^2\Big)^{\frac12}. \tag{9.18}$$

One easily checks that larger values of h and k do not create a larger error term than the case with $h=k=1$, so the proof is complete. □

10. Completion of the proof

In this section we combine estimates from Sections 8 and 9, and prove Proposition 7.3 which in turn implies Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Proposition 7.3. Using (8.1), Lemma 8.1, and (9.2), we obtain

$$S_\pm(N_1,N_2,N_3;C;B_0) \ll \sum_{M_1,M_2,M_3 \text{ dyadic}} \int_{|\mathbf{y}|\le T^\varepsilon} \frac{C^{1/2}\Delta T(N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}}{(M_1M_2M_3)^{1/2}V} \int_{|u|\ll U} \Big| \sum_{m_i\asymp M_i} \sum_{r\asymp C/q} m_1^{iy_1}m_2^{iy_2}m_3^{iy_3}c^{iy_4} G(m_1,m_2,m_3,qr) e_{qr}(-m_1m_2m_3) \Big(\frac{m_1m_2m_3}{qr}\Big)^{iu} du\Big|, \tag{10.1}$$

plus an error term of size $O(T^{-A})$. Recall we wish to show the bound (7.23). We need this for the three choices of U and V appearing in Lemma 8.1, so we do not specialize them yet. By Lemma 9.3 (and its following remark), we bound this by

$$\frac{C^{1/2}\Delta T(N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}}{(M_1M_2M_3)^{1/2}V} \frac{q^{1/2+\varepsilon}T^\varepsilon}{Cq} \Big(qU+M_1M_2\Big)^{1/2} \Big(qU+\frac{M_3C}{q}\Big)^{1/2} \Big(\frac{M_1M_2M_3C}{q}\Big)^{1/2}. \tag{10.2}$$

Without using any specializations yet, this simplifies as

$$\Delta T(N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}(qT)^\varepsilon \Big[\frac{1}{qV}\Big(qU+M_1M_2\Big)^{1/2} \Big(qU+\frac{M_3C}{q}\Big)^{1/2}\Big]. \tag{10.3}$$

As the desired bound $\Delta T(N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}(qT)^\varepsilon$ is already visible in front, we treat the part of (10.3) inside the square brackets.

First consider Case 1 from Lemma 8.1 where $M_i \asymp (N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}/N_i$, $V = T$, and U and C are given by (8.6) and (8.7). Here we have $qU \ll \frac{qT}{\Delta}T^\varepsilon$, $\frac{M_3C}{q} \ll \frac{N_1N_2}{\Delta Tq}T^\varepsilon \ll \frac{qT}{\Delta}T^\varepsilon$ (recalling $N_i \ll (qT)^{1+\varepsilon}$), and $M_1M_2 \asymp N_3 \ll (qT)^{1+\varepsilon}$. Thus (10.3) simplifies as

$$\Delta^{1/2}T(N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}(qT)^\varepsilon. \tag{10.4}$$

Next consider Case 2 from Lemma 8.1 with $\frac{M_iN_i}{C} \gg T^\varepsilon$. Here we have $X = \frac{M_1M_2M_3}{C}$, $V = T$, $U = X^{1/3}T^{2/3}$, (8.9), and $M_1N_1 \asymp M_2N_2 \asymp M_3N_3$. Using (8.9), we easily deduce $X \ll T\Delta^{-3+\varepsilon}$. This implies $U \ll \frac{T}{\Delta}T^\varepsilon$, exactly as the above Case 1. Similarly, $\frac{M_3C}{q} \ll \frac{N_1N_2}{qT\Delta}T^\varepsilon \ll (qT)^{1+\varepsilon}$, as in Case 1, and $M_1M_2 \ll N_3\Delta^{-2}T^\varepsilon$, which is slightly smaller than in Case 1. It is now clear that Case 2 gives the same bound as Case 1.

Finally we treat the case of $\frac{M_iN_i}{C} \ll T^\varepsilon$ (which holds for all i, otherwise K is small), giving that the expression in brackets is, using $X \ll T^\varepsilon$

$$\ll \frac{T^\varepsilon}{q}\Big(q + M_1M_2\Big)^{1/2}\Big(q + \frac{M_3C}{q}\Big)^{1/2} \ll \frac{T^\varepsilon}{q}\Big(q + \frac{C^2}{N_1N_2}\Big)^{1/2}\Big(q + \frac{C^2}{N_3q}\Big)^{1/2}. \tag{10.5}$$

It still remains true that $C \asymp \frac{(N_1N_2N_3)^{1/2}}{T}$, so we quickly bound the expression in brackets by $(qT)^\varepsilon$, as desired. □

References

[BKY] V. Blomer, R. Khan, and M. Young, *Distribution of mass of holomorphic cusp forms.* Duke Math. J. 162 (2013), no. 14, 2609–2644.

[Bl] V. Blomer, *Subconvexity for twisted L-functions on GL*(3). Amer. J. Math. 134 (2012), no. 5, 1385–1421.

[BH] V. Blomer and G. Harcos, *Hybrid bounds for twisted L-functions.* J. Reine Angew. Math. 621 (2008), 53–79.

[Bu] D. A. Burgess, *On character sums and L-series, I*, Proc. London Math. Soc. 12 (1962), 193–206.

[CI] J. B. Conrey and H. Iwaniec, *The cubic moment of central values of automorphic L-functions.* Ann. of Math. (2) 151 (2000), no. 3, 1175–1216.

[D] W. Duke, *Hyperbolic distribution problems and half-integral weight Maass forms.* Invent. Math. 92 (1988), no. 1, 73–90.

[Ga] P. X. Gallagher, *A large sieve density estimate near* $\sigma = 1$. Invent. Math. 11 1970 329–339.

[GR] I.S. Gradshteyn, and I.M. Ryzhik, *Table of Integrals, Series, and Products.* Translated from the Russian. Sixth edition. Translation edited and with a preface by Alan Jeffrey and Daniel Zwillinger. Academic Press, Inc., San Diego, CA, 2000.

[Gu] J. Guo, *On the positivity of the central critical values of automorphic L-functions for GL*(2), Duke Math. J. 83 (1996), 157–190.

[HM] G. Harcos and P. Michel, *The subconvexity problem for Rankin-Selberg L-functions and equidistribution of Heegner points. II.* Invent. Math. **163** (2006), 581–655.

[H-B1] D.R. Heath-Brown, *Hybrid bounds for Dirichlet L-functions.* Invent. Math. 47 (1978), no. 2, 149–170.

[H-B2] D.R. Heath-Brown, *Hybrid bounds for Dirichlet L-functions. II.* Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2) 31 (1980), no. 122, 157–167.

[HW] M. N. Huxley and N. Watt, *Hybrid bounds for Dirichlet's L-function.* Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 129 (2000), no. 3, 385–415.

[Iv] A. Ivić, *On sums of Hecke series in short intervals.* J. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux 13 (2001), no. 2, 453–468.

[Iw1] H. Iwaniec, *Fourier coefficients of modular forms of half-integral weight.* Invent. Math. 87 (1987), no. 2, 385–401.

[Iw2] H. Iwaniec, *Topics in Classical Automorphic Forms*, Grad. Stud. Math., vol 17, Amer. Math. Soc., 1997.

[IK] H. Iwaniec, E. Kowalski, *Analytic number theory*, AMS Colloquium Publications **53**, American Mathematical Society 2004.

[JM] M. Jutila and Y. Motohashi, *Uniform bound for Hecke L-functions.* Acta Math. 195 (2005), 61–115.
[KS] S. Katok and P. Sarnak, *Heegner points, cycles and Maass forms.* Israel J. Math. 84 (1993), no. 1-2, 193–227.
[KZ] W. Kohnen and D. Zagier, *Values of L-series of modular forms at the center of critical strip*. Invent. Math. **64** (1981), 175–198.
[Li] Xiaoqing Li, *Bounds for $GL(3)\times GL(2)$ L-functions and $GL(3)$ L-functions*, Ann. of Math. **173** (2011), 301-336.
[LMY] S.-C. Liu, R. Masri and Mattthew P. Young, *Subconvexity and equidistribution of Heegner points in the level aspect.* Compositio Math. **149** (2013), 1150–1174.
[Lu] Q. Lu, *Bounds for the spectral mean value of central values of L-functions.* J. Number Theory 132 (2012), no. 5, 1016–1037.
[Pen] Z. Peng, *Zeros and central values of automorphic L-functions*, Princeton PhD thesis 2001.
[Pet] I. Petrow, *The cubic moment revisited*, preprint 2014.
[W] J.-L. Waldspurger, *Sur les coefficients de Fourier des formes modulaires de poids demi-entier.* J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) 60 (1981), no. 4, 375–484.
[Y] M. Young, *The quantum unique ergodicity conjecture for thin sets*, preprint 2013, http://arxiv.org/abs/1306.1554.
[Z] S. W. Zhang, *Gross–Zagier formula for GL_2*. Asian J. Math. **5** (2001), 183–290.

Department of Mathematics, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843-3368, U.S.A.

E-mail address: myoung@math.tamu.edu